



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/779,663	02/18/2004	Motoyuki Ohsugi	826.1919	1338
21171	7590	07/03/2007		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER CHOU, ANDREW Y	
			ART UNIT 2192	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/03/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/779,663

Applicant(s)

OHSUGI ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew Y. Chou

Art Unit

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8 and 9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is response to Applicant's amendment dated 03/28/2007.

Claim 7 has been cancelled.

2. Claims 1-6, 8, and 9 remain pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's Remarks filed on 03/28/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

At page 5, paragraph 4 of the Remarks section, Applicant argues that Beniyama fails to disclose "definition information which defines information for controlling a work flow" as claimed in claim 1 of the present application. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees and points to Beniyama FIG. 6, which is a diagram showing the structure of a storage table for work flow execution status information. Furthermore, FIG. 6, column 0604 displays the "STATUS" which contains information defining the execution status of a work (see for example column 5, lines 19-29) i.e. information for controlling a work flow.

Also on page 5, Applicant argues in paragraph 5 that nothing in Beniyama has been found that teaches or suggests "screen definition information which defines screen items of a plurality of screens used in the work flow" as recited in claim 1, lines 3-4. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees and points to Beniyama FIG. 18, which is a diagram illustrating a display screen of an administration/definition tool. Furthermore, Examiner points to FIG. 18, items 1812. A "PROCESS DEFINITION NAME" is used to

Art Unit: 2192

define or indicate a process definition (see for example Beniyama column 18, lines 22-33), which is a screen item.

For the reasons discussed above, Examiner respectfully submits that Beniyama also anticipates claims 8 and 9 and the respective rejections are maintained.

On page 6 of the Remarks section, Applicant discusses claim 4, lines 3-5 which recites: "reading, from a storing device, flow definition information which defines a number of hierarchical levels, on each of which an approver gives and approval to a form, in a work flow of a form process". Applicant argues that Beniyama does not disclose the limitations recited above of claim 4 because "flow definition information includes a number of hierarchical levels that a form requiring approval passes through before being approved" (Remarks, page 6, paragraph 2, lines 9-12). Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

On page 6, paragraph 3 of the Remarks section, Applicant argues that Beniyama does not disclose or anticipate "flow definition information which defines presence/absence of withdrawal of a form forwarded in a work flow of a form process" as recited in claim 6, lines 3-4. Beniyama discloses that the " 'StartProcess' command receives a process instance name and a process definition name as inputs, and requests the work flow execution status control unit 0111 to start a process instance for a specified process definition with a specified process instance name" (see for example

Art Unit: 2192

Beniyama column 5, lines 49-53). Examiner contends that the command "StartProcess" does indeed indicate the absence of a withdrawal form. After reading "StartProcess", the command indicates that there is no withdrawal form and goes on to request the work flow execution status control unit 0111 to start a process instance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-6, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by Beniyama et al. US 6,799,314 B2 (hereinafter Beniyama).

Claim 1:

Beniyama discloses a work flow program generating apparatus, comprising:

a storing device (see for example FIG. 1, item 0154, "AUXILIARY STORAGE DEVICE", and related text) to store flow definition information which defines information for controlling a work flow (see for example FIG. 6, column 0604, "STATUS", and related text), and screen definition information which defines screen items of a plurality of

Art Unit: 2192

screens used in the work flow (see for example FIG. 18, items 1812. A "PROCESS DEFINITION NAME, and related text); and

a generating device (see for example FIG. 1, item 0112, and related text) to read the flow definition information (see for example FIG. 2, and related text) and the screen definition information from said storing device, and to generate a screen program, which includes a program code for controlling a flow among the plurality of screens, by using the read flow definition information and screen definition information (see for example FIG. 3, and related text).

Claim 2:

Beniyama discloses a computer-readable storage medium (see for example FIG. 1, item 0155, and related text) on which is recorded a program for causing a computer to execute a process, the process comprising:

reading, from a storing device, flow definition information which defines information for controlling a work flow, and screen definition information which defines screen items of a plurality of screens used in the work flow (see for example FIG. 12, item 1204, and related text); and

generating a screen program, which includes a program code for controlling a flow among the plurality of screens, by using the read flow definition information and screen definition information (see for example FIG. 7, item 0711, "application program execution request", and related text).

Claim 3:

Art Unit: 2192

Beniyama discloses a computer-readable storage medium on which is recorded a program for causing a computer to execute a process, the process comprising:

reading, from a storing device, flow definition information which defines information for controlling a work flow of a form process, and screen definition information which defines screen items of a plurality of screens used in the work flow (see for example FIG. 12, item 1204, and related text);

generating a screen program for displaying a screen, on which data for updating a form table storing form data is input, and a screen program for displaying a screen, on which data of the form table is referred to, by using the read screen definition information (see for example FIG. 7, item 0711, "application program execution request", and related text);

generating a screen program for displaying a screen, on which data for updating a work flow table storing data of the work flow of the form process is input, by using the read flow definition information and screen definition information (see for example FIG. 3, column 4, lines 45-63, and related text); and

generating a screen program for displaying a screen, on which data of the form table is referred to, based on the data of the work flow table by using the read screen definition information (see for example column 4, lines 45-63, and related text).

Claim 4:

Beniyama discloses a computer-readable storage medium on which is recorded a program for causing a computer to execute a process, the process comprising:

Art Unit: 2192

reading, from a storing device, flow definition information which defines a number of hierarchical levels, on each of which an approver gives approval to a form, in a work flow of a form process (see for example FIG. 12, item 1204, and related text); and

generating a screen program for displaying a screen, which includes input items of approvers by the number of hierarchical levels, by using the read flow definition information (see for example FIG. 7, item 0711, "application program execution request", and related text).

Claim 5:

Beniyama further discloses the computer-readable storage medium according to claim 4, wherein

the computer reads, from the storing device, screen definition information which defines screen items of a screen used in the work flow of the form process, and generates a screen program for displaying a listing screen of forms, which wait for approval given by the approvers, by using the read screen definition information (see for example column 5, lines 54-66).

Claim 6:

Beniyama discloses a computer-readable storage medium on which is recorded a program for causing a computer to execute a process, the process comprising:

reading, from a storing device, flow definition information which defines presence/absence of withdrawal of a form forwarded in a work flow of a form process (see for example column 5, lines 36-54, "StartProcess"); and

generating a screen program for displaying a screen, which includes a button for withdrawing a form, if the read flow definition information indicates the presence of withdrawal, and generating a screen program for displaying a screen, which does not include a button for withdrawing a form, if the flow definition information indicates the absence of withdrawal (see for example FIG. 10, and related text).

Claim 8:

Beniyama discloses a work flow program generating method, comprising:

reading, from a storing device, flow definition information which defines information for controlling a work flow, and screen definition information which defines screen items of a plurality of screens used in the work flow, by a generating device (see for example FIG. 12, item 1204, and related text); and

generating a screen program including a program code for controlling a flow among the plurality of screens by using the read flow definition information and screen definition information, by the generating device (see for example FIG. 7, item 0711, "application program execution request", and related text).

Claim 9:

Beniyama discloses a work flow program generating apparatus, comprising:

storing means for storing flow definition information which defines information for controlling a work flow, and screen definition information which defines screen items of a plurality of screens used in the work flow see for example FIG. 1, item 0122, and related text); and

generating means for reading the flow definition information and the screen definition information from said storing means, and for generating a screen program, which includes a program code for controlling a flow among the plurality of screens, by using the read flow definition information and screen definition information (see for example FIG. 1, item 0112, and related text).

Conclusion


6. Applicant's Remarks filed on 03/28/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272 2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

AYC



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER